



UNIVERSITY OF  
HOHENHEIM

200  
1818  
2018  
YEARS

Hohenheim Discussion Papers in Business, Economics and Social Sciences

# PERCEIVED WAGES AND THE GENDER GAP IN STEM FIELDS

**Aderonke Osikominu**  
University of Hohenheim

**Gregor Pfeifer**  
University of Hohenheim

Research Area INEPA

03-2018

Discussion Paper 03-2018

## **Perceived Wages and the Gender Gap in STEM Fields**

Aderonke Osikominu, Gregor Pfeifer

Download this Discussion Paper from our homepage:

<https://wiso.uni-hohenheim.de/papers>

ISSN 2364-2084

Die Hohenheim Discussion Papers in Business, Economics and Social Sciences dienen der schnellen Verbreitung von Forschungsarbeiten der Fakultät Wirtschafts- und Sozialwissenschaften. Die Beiträge liegen in alleiniger Verantwortung der Autoren und stellen nicht notwendigerweise die Meinung der Fakultät Wirtschafts- und Sozialwissenschaften dar.

---

Hohenheim Discussion Papers in Business, Economics and Social Sciences are intended to make results of the Faculty of Business, Economics and Social Sciences research available to the public in order to encourage scientific discussion and suggestions for revisions. The authors are solely responsible for the contents which do not necessarily represent the opinion of the Faculty of Business, Economics and Social Sciences.

# Perceived Wages and the Gender Gap in STEM Fields

ADERONKE OSIKOMINU<sup>‡</sup> & GREGOR PFEIFER<sup>‡</sup>

<sup>‡</sup>University of Hohenheim and IAB, CEPR, CESifo, IZA, a.osikominu@uni-hohenheim.de

<sup>‡</sup>University of Hohenheim, g.pfeifer@uni-hohenheim.de (corresponding author)

This version: February 1, 2018

**Abstract:** We estimate gender differences in elicited wage expectations among German University students applying for STEM and non-STEM fields. Descriptively, women expect to earn less than men and also have lower expectations about wages of average graduates across different fields. Using a two-step estimation procedure accounting for self-selection, we find that the gender gap in own expected wages can be explained to the extent of 54-69% by wage expectations for average graduates across different fields. However, gender differences in the wage expectations for average graduates across different fields do not contribute to explaining the gender gap in the choice of STEM majors.

**Keywords:** gender gap; wage expectations; college major choice; STEM.

**JEL:** I21; J16; J31.

# 1 Introduction

Occupations related to Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) feature higher wages on average as compared with non-STEM fields; moreover, STEM employment opportunities are predicted to grow in the future (U.S. Department of Commerce, 2011; U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2014). Despite these advantages, females remain under-represented in STEM occupations as well as in college degree completion. According to Blau and Kahn (2017), one of the main causes of the gender wage gap is precisely such male-female sorting into different majors and corresponding occupations, which is why encouraging women into STEM fields has become an important policy concern.

In this paper, we examine the gender gap using elicited expectations of future salaries, focusing on differences between STEM and non-STEM majors. We use a two-step estimation procedure, which accounts for self-selection in the spirit of Heckman (1979). In a first stage, we estimate the reduced form probability of choosing a STEM major using a full set of controls, which includes wage expectations for average other students across all available fields of study. In a second stage, we estimate separate earnings regressions for prospective STEM and non-STEM students, where the expected own future salary of a student serves as dependent variable and the respective Mills ratio from the first stage controls for self-selection. Moreover, wage expectations for average other students across STEM fields serve as instruments for people choosing STEM, while wage expectations for average other students across non-STEM fields serve as instruments for people choosing non-STEM. Lastly, we decompose our estimation results and elaborate on explained and unexplained parts of the gender gap we observe.

With this research, we relate to different contributions on students' choices using elicited expectations. For instance, Wiswall and Zafar (2015) as well as Arcidiacono et al. (2012) study specific determinants of college major choice, showing that beliefs about earnings and ability, but also personal tastes, play a significant role (see also Beffy et al., 2012). Arcidiacono et al. (2017) focus on the choice of occupation using elicited beliefs from a

sample of male undergraduates, and show evidence of strong sorting across occupations on expected earnings.<sup>1</sup> Zafar (2011) analyzes how students form expectations regarding major-specific outcomes, showing that learning plays a key role within that process. Stinebrickner and Stinebrickner (2012) as well as Stinebrickner and Stinebrickner (2014) also incorporate subjective expectations into models of choice behavior, analyzing the updating of beliefs and its influence on later outcomes, while the latter contribution also slightly discusses STEM fields. Arcidiacono et al. (2016) focus on differences in graduation rates of minorities within STEM fields, estimating a model of students' college major choice, where net returns of a science major differ across campuses and student preparation. Zafar (2013) focuses on the gender pay gap and reveals that females value non-pecuniary outcomes when deciding on a specific college major, while males are incentivized by pecuniary outcomes. Gemici and Wiswall (2014) also look at gender differences, estimating a dynamic overlapping generations model of human capital investments and labor supply, and find that changes in skill prices, higher schooling costs, and gender-specific changes in home value were important to long-term trends.<sup>2</sup>

To the best of our knowledge, our paper is first to aim at combining these research streams by looking at gender gaps using elicited expectations at the time of college major choice with a particular focus on STEM fields. Moreover, while almost all related research exclusively focuses on the U.S.,<sup>3</sup> we look at students in Germany, a country that basically offers tuition-free education utilized by roughly 2.8 million university students of which about 500,000 are freshmen. Finally, using data on slightly more than 2,000 students, we draw on a considerably larger sample than most of the relevant literature, which usually works with some hundreds of observations.

Based on the first step of our estimation procedure, the reduced form probit of major

---

<sup>1</sup> Wiswall and Zafar (2018) estimate preferences for workplace attributes and relate them to college major choices and to actual job choices.

<sup>2</sup> Wiswall and Zafar (2018) state that gender differences in job preferences explain at least a quarter of the early career gender wage gap.

<sup>3</sup> An exception is Beffy et al. (2012), who concentrate on France.

choice shows that being female as compared with being male reduces the probability of studying a STEM major by more than 50% *ceteris paribus*. Moreover, an increase in expected wages for average graduates from STEM-fields by ten percent raises the probability to choose a STEM major by about four percent in relative terms. Higher expected wages for average graduates from non-STEM fields either decrease the probability of studying STEM or do not influence the decision at all.

Secondly, our wage regressions show that a ten percent increase in the expected wage of an average graduate from Mathematics and Computer Science (Natural Sciences) increases the own expected salary of a prospective STEM student by 6.1% (3.4%). Similarly, a ten percent increase in the expected wage of an average graduate from Law or Business Administration raises the own expected salary of a prospective non-STEM student by 2.1 to 2.5%. Expectations about salaries of average graduates in different fields, that capture how an average graduate in the respective field is rewarded on the labor market, serve as our exclusion restrictions: the two sets of instruments are each statistically significant at a 1% level. Results on self-selection imply that prospective students who choose STEM expect to earn more than average in both STEM and non-STEM fields, but have a comparative advantage in STEM. In contrast, those who choose non-STEM have expected future earnings below average in both STEM and non-STEM fields, but still higher in non-STEM compared with STEM.

Finally, our decomposition results suggest that gender differences in *wage expectations* are important. The total gender gap in own expected wages among prospective STEM students is with 36% more than twice as large than the gender gap of 14% among prospective non-STEM students. Of these total gaps, a substantial fraction can be explained by gender differences in the means of covariates: 54% and 69% for STEM and non-STEM, respectively. We can show that gender differences in the expectations about salaries of average graduates in different fields account almost entirely for this result. This suggests that women are not simply much less confident than men concerning the expectations about their own future

remuneration. Rather, women’s different perceptions about how average graduates across different fields are rewarded on the labor market lead them to expect lower future earnings for themselves than men. Contrarily, gender differences in wage expectations do not seem to explain the different *preferences for college majors* of men and women. This picture is consistent with a situation in which the major choice of women—unlike that of men—is more guided by non-monetary incentives rather than pecuniary rewards.

The remainder of the paper proceeds as follows: Section 2 discusses the data and shows first descriptive evidence. Section 3 explains our estimation strategy, and Section 4 shows corresponding results. Section 5 concludes.

## 2 Data

During the application processes in 2011 and 2012 at Saarland University, Germany, we surveyed students on their beliefs about future starting salaries. The survey’s URL was e-mailed to all prospective students applying for admission, while only students submitting a complete application were considered. In 2011, 500 students completed the survey; in 2012, 1,561 students responded. Part of that increase is due to the fact that we were able to add two more majors (Education and Medicine).<sup>4</sup>

The survey started with questions regarding the prospective students’ field of study. It was asked for which degree (Bachelor, Master, State Examination) and for which field of study the student had currently applied for. Students had to state whether they would aspire to obtain an additional degree afterwards (Master, Second State Examination, or a Doctoral Degree), and with which of those degrees they would aim to earn their first salary. About a quarter of the respondents seek to study either a business related field or Medicine, respectively, followed by Law Studies, Natural Sciences, Humanities, Education, and Mathematics/Computer Sciences. Under STEM, we subsume the fields Mathematics and Computer Science as well as Natural Sciences. The remainder comprises the group of

---

<sup>4</sup> In 2011, this was not possible due to administrative reasons.

non-STEM.

In the second part of the survey, students had to answer two different types of questions about monthly gross salaries. The first one asked students about expectations of their own monthly salary and about their estimates for average others who studied within the same field. The second type of questions asked students about their estimates of average monthly gross salaries for other students in different fields of study.

In the third part of the survey, students had to provide information on their personal and family background. The following characteristics were considered: gender; age; work experience; final grade in secondary school; whether the student’s mother or father has a tertiary education degree; whether the student intends to live at her parents’ home while studying; whether the student expects to receive funding from the public student loan scheme “BAfoeG”;<sup>5</sup> the school system in secondary school; the federal state in which the student obtained her higher education entrance qualification; the importance of an above-average salary; the influence of income expectations on the student’s major choice; the student’s favorite branch of business and her work experience in this branch.

Table 1 shows relevant summary statistics. While we see 20.4% and 11.2% of survey respondents applying for STEM fields being male and female, respectively, we also observe distinct differences regarding wage expectations by gender: men expect to receive higher starting salaries than women, with the difference being 30.6 log points among prospective STEM students and 13.1 log points among non-STEM. Also, women expect field related starting salaries of average graduates to be lower than men, but the gender differences are less pronounced than for own starting salaries. In contrast to the patterns for the levels, women and men rank the different fields in the same way. Both groups expect an average graduate from Medicine to receive the highest salary and an average graduate from Humanities the lowest. All in all, these patterns raise the question whether and to what extent gender

---

<sup>5</sup> The German *Bundesausbildungsförderungsgesetz*, short BAfoeG, is a federal law on support in education, providing students from a weaker financial background with funding—specifically, with affordable student loans.



differences in the propensity to study a STEM major as well as in expected own future salaries could be driven by the fact that young men and women have different expectations about the average remunerations of different fields of study.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics

	Males (1)	Females (2)	<i>t</i> -Statistic (3)
Expectations about own starting salary			
Applicants to STEM fields	8.189 (0.523)	7.883 (0.579)	10.611
Applicants to non-STEM fields	8.034 (0.515)	7.903 (0.519)	4.788
Share applying to STEM fields	0.204 (0.403)	0.112 (0.316)	4.722
Expectations about salary of average graduate by field of study			
Natural Sciences	7.999 (0.488)	7.934 (0.523)	2.435
Math/Computer Sciences	8.065 (0.486)	8.002 (0.527)	2.377
Humanities	7.749 (0.489)	7.616 (0.535)	4.925
Business Administration	7.998 (0.473)	7.885 (0.519)	4.327
Law	8.103 (0.486)	8.036 (0.527)	2.550
Education	7.901 (0.453)	7.819 (0.497)	3.330
Medicine	8.171 (0.525)	8.086 (0.533)	3.052
Observations	632	836	

*Source:* Applicant Survey, own calculations. *Note:* The first two columns show the means and standard deviations (in parentheses) of the variables, the last column the *t*-statistics of a test of equality of means. Wages are in logs.

### 3 Methodology

Let  $\mathbf{x}_{i1}$  be a row vector of variables that influence the return to STEM fields, whereas  $\mathbf{x}_{i0}$  denotes a row vector of variables that influence the return to non-STEM fields. We refer to the combined regressor vector as  $\mathbf{x}_i$ , where  $\mathbf{x}_{i1} \subset \mathbf{x}_i$  and  $\mathbf{x}_{i0} \subset \mathbf{x}_i$ . Besides controls on the student's background, the importance of salary as a job value, and the highest intended degree, we consider expected salaries for average graduates in *all* other fields, i.e., Medicine, Law Studies, Natural Sciences, Humanities, Education, and Mathematics/Computer Science.

As a first stage, we estimate a reduced form model for major choice

$$\Pr\{s_i = 1 \mid \mathbf{x}_i\} = \Pr\{\varepsilon_i \geq -\mathbf{x}_i\boldsymbol{\pi} \mid \mathbf{x}_i\} = \Phi(\mathbf{x}_i\boldsymbol{\pi}), \quad (1)$$

where  $s_i$  is an indicator function that takes on value one when utility from choosing a STEM field is at least as high as utility when choosing a non-STEM field.  $\boldsymbol{\pi}$  is a column vector of coefficients.  $\varepsilon_i$  denotes the error term. For practical purposes, we assume the error term to be standard normally distributed, i.e.  $\varepsilon_i \mid \mathbf{x}_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ , although this assumption as well as linearity of the index are not needed for identification since we rely on exclusion restrictions (French and Taber, 2011). The function  $\Phi$  thus denotes the standard normal c.d.f.; its p.d.f. is denoted by  $\varphi$ . More precisely, we estimate this first stage pooling across gender and including a female dummy.

As a second stage, we estimate wage regressions

$$\ln y_{i1} = \beta_{01} + \mathbf{x}_{i1}\boldsymbol{\beta}_1 + \gamma_1\lambda_{i1} + \eta_{i1}, \quad (2)$$

$$\ln y_{i0} = \beta_{00} + \mathbf{x}_{i0}\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + \gamma_0\lambda_{i0} + \eta_{i0}, \quad (3)$$

where  $\ln y_{ij}$  denotes the log wage rate a prospective student in field  $j$ ,  $j \in \{0, 1\}$ , expects to earn after graduation and  $\eta_{ij}$  an error term. The terms

$$\lambda_{i1} \equiv \frac{\varphi(\mathbf{x}_i\boldsymbol{\pi})}{\Phi(\mathbf{x}_i\boldsymbol{\pi})}, \quad \lambda_{i0} \equiv -\frac{\varphi(\mathbf{x}_i\boldsymbol{\pi})}{1 - \Phi(\mathbf{x}_i\boldsymbol{\pi})}, \quad (4)$$

denote inverse Mills ratios that account for self-selection into STEM and non-STEM fields (Heckman, 1979). If the estimate of  $\gamma_1$  is positive and  $\gamma_0$  is negative, this is evidence for positive selection bias in the sense that mean earnings associated with a major are higher in the subgroup of people who have chosen that major than in the total population. In line with the classical Roy (1951) model, we impose exclusion restrictions on the second stage earnings

models. Expectations about the remuneration of an average graduate from the STEM fields Mathematics/Computer Science and Natural Sciences should only affect the own expected wage of prospective students in STEM fields. The reverse reasoning applies to non-STEM fields. Therefore, in the earnings equation for STEM, we consider wage expectations for average graduates in Mathematics/Computer Sciences and Natural Sciences. Analogously, for non-STEM, we use wage expectations for average students in Medicine, Law Studies, Humanities, and Education. The exclusion restrictions ensure that our estimation results are not driven by distributional assumptions on the error term of the reduced form choice model because the index function of the inverse Mills ratio includes regressors that do not directly enter the earnings equation (French and Taber, 2011). Both earnings equations include the additional control variables used also in the first stage choice model and the correction term for self-selection based on the respective inverse Mills ratio, which we calculate from the first stage estimates. We again pool observations across gender.

Finally, we use our estimation results to decompose the gender difference in the means of the dependent variables in Equations (1) to (3) into a part that can be explained by gender differences in the covariates included in the models and an unexplained part. We further evaluate the individual contributions of different groups of covariates to the explained gender gap. For decomposing the log of the own expected salary, we use the familiar method developed by Blinder (1973) and Oaxaca (1973). For decomposing the probability to choose a STEM field based on the probit regression, we use the method proposed by Fairlie (2005), who adapts the Blinder-Oaxaca approach to the case of non-linear binary choice models.<sup>6</sup> For a related decomposition analysis of a model for college major choice, see Zafar (2013).

## 4 Results

Columns (1) and (2) of Table 2 provide results from the reduced form probit: the first column shows the coefficients for the probability of studying STEM, and the second column

---

<sup>6</sup> The decompositions are implemented with the Stata modules Jann (2006) and Jann (2008).

gives corresponding average partial effects. While we include the full set of available control variables, some coefficients are noteworthy. Being female as compared with being male reduces the probability of studying a STEM major by eight percentage points, a relative decline by 53%, which is statistically significant at a 1% level. Moreover, and as one could have expected, an increase in expected wages for average graduates from the STEM-fields (i.e., Mathematics/Computer Science and Natural Sciences) by ten log points (approx. 10%) raises the probability to choose a STEM major by around 0.6 percentage points, about four percent in relative terms. Higher expected wages for average graduates from non-STEM fields either decrease the probability of studying STEM or do not influence the decision at all. Specifically, an increase in the expected wage for an average graduate from Business Administration by 10 log points decreases the probability to study STEM by 0.9 percentage points, a relative effect of six percent.

Columns (3) and (4) of Table 2 display the estimates of the selection-corrected wage equations for both STEM and non-STEM, with the log of the expected own future salary as the dependent variable. These columns answer the question how certain characteristics influence the expected own STEM/non-STEM salary—controlling for self-selection into field of study. Expectations about salaries of average graduates in different fields, that capture how an average graduate in the respective field is rewarded on the labor market, serve as our exclusion restrictions. Expectations about the wages of average graduates of STEM-fields affect the own expected wage of prospective STEM students, whereas expected wages of average graduates of non-STEM fields influence only the own expected wage of non-STEM applicants. All of these coefficients, which can be interpreted as elasticities, show the expected positive sign and are (highly) statistically significant. In particular, a ten percent increase in the expected wage of an average graduate from Mathematics and Computer Science (Natural Sciences) increases the own expected salary of a prospective STEM student by 6.1% (3.4%). Similarly, a ten percent increase in the expected wage of an average graduate from Law or Business Administration raises the own expected salary of a prospective non-

Table 2: Estimation Results

	Major Choice		Log Earnings	
	Coefficient	APE	STEM	Non-STEM
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Expectations about salary of average graduate in different fields (in logs)				
Natural Sciences	0.343 (0.194)*	0.064 (0.035)*	0.339 (0.122)***	
Math/Computer Sciences	0.296 (0.176)*	0.055 (0.032)*	0.611 (0.100)***	
Humanities	-0.279 (0.154)*	-0.052 (0.028)*		0.222 (0.047)***
Business Administration	-0.470 (0.185)**	-0.088 (0.034)***		0.247 (0.050)***
Law	0.245 (0.170)	0.046 (0.031)		0.209 (0.057)***
Education	-0.036 (0.153)	-0.007 (0.028)		0.066 (0.039)*
Medicine	0.071 (0.153)	0.013 (0.028)		0.138 (0.039)***
Selected other variables				
Female dummy	-0.421 (0.088)***	-0.081 (0.017)***	-0.272 (0.078)***	-0.069 (0.026)***
Correction term for sample selection			0.415 (0.204)**	0.251 (0.149)*

*Source:* Applicant Survey, own calculations. *Note:* APE denotes average partial effect. All models include additional controls for the importance of salary as a job value (4 dummies), the degree with which one intends to leave university (3 dummies), background characteristics (5 variables) and a dummy for survey cohort as well as an intercept. Bootstrapped standard errors are shown in parentheses. \*, \*\*, and \*\*\* denote significance at the 10%-, 5%-, and 1%-level, respectively.

STEM student by 2.1 to 2.5%. Moreover, Table 3 shows that the sets of instruments are also jointly statistically significant, yielding Wald test  $p$ -values of virtually zero. It also provides an analogous joint test for the remaining covariates (excluding the correction term for self-selection). Going back to Table 2, the coefficient on the inverse Mills ratio at the very end of Column (3), being 0.415, suggests significantly positive self-selection of STEM applicants compared with the total population. In contrast, prospective students of non-STEM fields tend to be negatively selected (coefficient of 0.251 at the end of Column (4)), but the selection correction term is not significant at the 5% level.<sup>7</sup> Taken together, the results on self-selection imply that prospective students who choose STEM expect to earn more than average in both STEM and non-STEM fields, but have a comparative advantage in STEM. In contrast, those who choose non-STEM have expected future earnings below average in both STEM and non-STEM fields, but still higher in non-STEM compared with STEM. Interestingly, the patterns of self-selection differ somewhat when we estimate separate earnings regressions by gender (full results available on request). While, for men, we observe the same selectivity pattern as in the pooled estimation, prospective female students in both STEM and non-STEM fields tend to be positively self-selected compared with the total female population. In the estimations by gender, the selection correction terms are not all statistically significant, though.

Table 4 shows the decomposition results. Column (1) decomposes the estimation results of the reduced form regression of major choice displayed in Column (1) of Table 2 based on the method by Fairlie (2005). Columns (2) and (3) of Table 4 show the analogous decomposition results based on the earnings regressions in Columns (2) and (3) of Table 2. These decompositions are based on the method by Blinder (1973) and Oaxaca (1973). Focusing on the global decomposition results for expected own earnings (Columns (2) to (3) in the top panel of Table 4), we see that the total gender gap among prospective STEM students is with 31 log points (36%) more than twice as large than the gender gap of 13 log points

---

<sup>7</sup> Recall from Equation (4), that a positive  $\gamma_1$  and a negative  $\gamma_0$  corresponds to positive self-selection into STEM and non-STEM fields, respectively.

Table 3: Wald Tests of Joint Significance

	Major Choice	Log STEM Earnings	Log Non- STEM Earnings
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Expectations about average salaries			
$\chi^2$ -statistic	23.785	278.355	1315.126
degr. of freedom	7	2	5
$p$ -value	0.001	0.000	0.000
Remaining variables, except selection correction term			
$\chi^2$ -statistic	179.817	37.673	113.133
degr. of freedom	16	16	16
$p$ -value	0.000	0.002	0.000

*Source:* Applicant Survey, own calculations. *Note:* Variance matrices for test statistics are bootstrapped.

(14%) among prospective non-STEM students. Of these total gaps, a substantial fraction can be explained by gender differences in the means of covariates: 54% for STEM and 69% for non-STEM. The detailed decomposition results in the lower panel of Table 4 reveal that gender differences in the expectations about salaries of average graduates in their field account almost entirely for this result. For STEM, gender differences in expected salaries of average graduates contribute 16 log points to explaining the total gender gap in own expected salaries of 31 log points. For non-STEM, the corresponding figures are eight log points out of 13. These patterns suggest that women are not simply much less confident than men concerning their own future remuneration on the labor market. Rather, they tend to have different perceptions than men about how different fields of study are rewarded on the labor market, which in turn explains their different expectations about the own future salary.

The decomposition results for own expected salaries stand in sharp contrast with those for major choice (Column (1) in the top panel of Table 4), which suggest that the total gender gap of nine percentage points cannot be explained by gender differences in the means of the covariates considered. This is also reflected in the detailed results, which show that

Table 4: Decomposition Results

	Major Choice	Log STEM Earnings	Log Non- STEM Earnings
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Global results			
Mean of males	0.204 (0.016)***	8.189 (0.047)***	8.034 (0.022)***
Mean of females	0.112 (0.010)***	7.883 (0.057)***	7.903 (0.019)***
Gender gap	0.092 (0.018)***	0.306 (0.075)***	0.130 (0.030)***
Explained gap	0.007 (0.011)	0.164 (0.064)**	0.089 (0.024)***
Unexplained gap	0.084 (0.017)***	0.143 (0.046)***	0.041 (0.019)**
Contributions of covariates to the explained gap			
Expectations about average salaries	-0.009 (0.005)*	0.158 (0.064)**	0.076 (0.023)***
Importance of salary	-0.003 (0.003)	-0.001 (0.012)	0.004 (0.004)
Intended degree	0.008 (0.005)	0.012 (0.026)	0.005 (0.005)
Background characteristics	-0.000 (0.007)	0.038 (0.026)	-0.004 (0.006)
Survey cohort	0.012 (0.004)***	-0.043 (0.034)	0.008 (0.006)

*Source:* Applicant Survey, own calculations. *Note:* The decomposition results in Column (1) are based on the method by Fairlie (2005), the decomposition results in Columns (2) and (3) are based on the method developed in Blinder (1973) and Oaxaca (1973). All decompositions use as basis the coefficients of a pooled model that includes a female dummy (see Table 2). Bootstrapped standard errors are shown in parentheses. \*, \*\*, and \*\*\* denote significance at the 10%-, 5%-, and 1%-level, respectively.



gender differences in wage expectations cannot account for the gender gap in major choice, with a coefficient close to zero (lower panel of Table 4). Overall, these results indicate that, while gender differences in wage expectations are important, they do not seem to explain the different preferences for college majors of men and women. Separate estimations of the choice model for men and women suggest that wage expectations do not affect the major choice of women in a statistically significant way, but only of men (full results available on request). Women seem to be more guided by non-monetary incentives (personal tastes, psychic costs) than by their assessment of how majors are rewarded on the labor market. Thus, their differential wage expectations compared with men cannot explain why women are less inclined to study a STEM field than men. The fact that pecuniary rewards of major choice seem to be more important to men than to women has also been documented in Zafar (2013).

## 5 Conclusion

We examined gender differences among prospective students with respect to their wage expectations and the probability to choose a STEM major. Descriptively, we see that women in fact have different expectations about wages than men. For their own future salary, they expect less than men, which might be explained by looking at their expectations about wages of average graduates across different fields of study: here, women also have consistently lower expectations than men.

We estimated a binary college major choice model using the wage expectations for an average graduate across different fields and additional student characteristics as controls. Corresponding probit estimates suggest that women are *ceteris paribus* 50% less likely to choose STEM than men. Moreover, an increase in expected wages for average graduates from STEM fields by ten percent raises the probability to choose a STEM major by about four percent. Higher expected wages for average graduates from non-STEM fields either

decrease the probability of choosing STEM or do not influence the decision at all.

In a second step, we regressed the own expected salary on the expected wages for an average graduate from the relevant fields, a correction term for self-selection into field of study, and additional student characteristics. The regression of own expected earnings among STEM applicants shows that an increase in the expected wage of an average graduate from Mathematics/Computer Science or Natural Sciences by ten percent increases the own expected salary by 3% to 6%. Analogously, an increase in the expected wages of average graduates from other fields raises the own expected salary of a prospective non-STEM student. Moreover, our findings suggest significantly positive self-selection of STEM applicants compared with the total population.

Finally, our decomposition results indicate that gender differences in wage expectations for average graduates are important for explaining gender differences in own expected salaries of both STEM and non-STEM students. This suggests that women are not simply much less confident than men about their own remuneration but that they have different perceptions about how different fields of study are rewarded on the labor market, which, in turn, affects what they expect to earn for themselves. In contrast, gender differences in wage expectations do not seem to explain the different propensities of men and women to study STEM. The latter finding is in line with the literature on college major choice, showing that for men future earnings are more important than for women, for whom non-monetary incentives play a bigger role (Zafar, 2013). With our data, we cannot directly account for differences in preferences related to non-monetary aspects, which makes it plausible that the gender gap in major choice remains largely unexplained.

## References

- Arcidiacono, P., Aucejo, E. M., and Hotz, V. J. (2016). University differences in the graduation of minorities in stem fields: Evidence from california. *American Economic Review*, 106(3):525–562.
- Arcidiacono, P., Hotz, V. J., and Kang, S. (2012). Modeling college major choices using elicited measures of expectations and counterfactuals. *Journal of Econometrics*, 166(1):3–16.
- Arcidiacono, P., Hotz, V. J., Maurel, A., and Romano, T. (2017). Recovering ex ante returns and preferences for occupations using subjective expectations data. Working Paper 20626, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Beffy, M., Fougère, D., and Maurel, A. (2012). Choosing the field of study in postsecondary education: Do expected earnings matter? *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 94(1):334–347.
- Blau, F. D. and Kahn, L. M. (2017). The gender wage gap: Extent, trends, and explanations. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 55(3):789–865.
- Blinder, A. S. (1973). Wage discrimination: Reduced form and structural estimates. *The Journal of Human Resources*, 8(4):436–455.
- Fairlie, R. W. (2005). An Extension of the Blinder-Oaxaca Decomposition Technique to Logit and Probit Models. *Journal of Economic and Social Measurement*, 30(4):305–316.
- French, E. and Taber, C. (2011). Identification of models of the labor market. In Ashenfelter, O. and Card, D., editors, *Handbook of Labor Economics, Vol. 4A, ch. 6*, pages 537–617. Elsevier Science, Amsterdam.
- Gemici, A. and Wiswall, M. (2014). Evolution of gender differences in post-secondary human capital investments: College majors. *International Economic Review*, 55(1):23–56.
- Heckman, J. J. (1979). Sample selection bias as a specification error. *Econometrica*, 47(1):153–161.
- Jann, B. (2006). fairlie: Stata module to generate nonlinear decomposition of binary outcome differentials. Technical report, mimeo, available from <http://ideas.repec.org/c/boc/bocode/s456727.html>.
- Jann, B. (2008). The blinder-oaxaca decomposition for linear regression models. *The Stata Journal*, 8(4):453–479.
- Oaxaca, R. (1973). Male-female wage differentials in urban labor markets. *International Economic Review*, 14(3):693–709.
- Roy, A. D. (1951). Some thoughts on the distribution of earnings. *Oxford Economic Papers*, 3(2):135–146.

- Stinebrickner, R. and Stinebrickner, T. R. (2014). A major in science? initial beliefs and final outcomes for college major and dropout. *Review of Economic Studies*, 81(1):426–472.
- Stinebrickner, T. and Stinebrickner, R. (2012). Learning about academic ability and the college dropout decision. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 30(4):707–748.
- U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (2014). STEM 101: Intro to tomorrow’s jobs. Occupational Statistics and Employment Projections.
- U.S. Department of Commerce (2011). STEM: Good Jobs Now and For the Future. Economics & Statistics Administration.
- Wiswall, M. and Zafar, B. (2015). Determinants of college major choice: Identification using an information experiment. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 82(2):791–824.
- Wiswall, M. and Zafar, B. (2018). Preference for the workplace, investment in human capital, and gender. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 133(1):457–507.
- Zafar, B. (2011). How Do College Students Form Expectations? *Journal of Labor Economics*, 29(2):301–348.
- Zafar, B. (2013). College major choice and the gender gap. *Journal of Human Resources*, 48(3):545–595.

## Hohenheim Discussion Papers in Business, Economics and Social Sciences

The Faculty of Business, Economics and Social Sciences continues since 2015 the established “FZID Discussion Paper Series” of the “Centre for Research on Innovation and Services (FZID)” under the name “Hohenheim Discussion Papers in Business, Economics and Social Sciences”.

### Institutes

510	Institute of Financial Management
520	Institute of Economics
530	Institute of Health Care & Public Management
540	Institute of Communication Science
550	Institute of Law and Social Sciences
560	Institute of Economic and Business Education
570	Institute of Marketing & Management
580	Institute of Interorganizational Management & Performance

### Research Areas (since 2017)

INEPA	“Inequality and Economic Policy Analysis”
TKID	“Transformation der Kommunikation – Integration und Desintegration”
NegoTrans	“Negotiation Research – Transformation, Technology, Media and Costs”
INEF	“Innovation, Entrepreneurship and Finance”

Download Hohenheim Discussion Papers in Business, Economics and Social Sciences  
from our homepage: <https://wiso.uni-hohenheim.de/papers>

No.	Author	Title	Inst
01-2015	Thomas Beissinger, Philipp Baudy	THE IMPACT OF TEMPORARY AGENCY WORK ON TRADE UNION WAGE SETTING: A Theoretical Analysis	520
02-2015	Fabian Wahl	PARTICIPATIVE POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS AND CITY DEVELOPMENT 800-1800	520
03-2015	Tommaso Proietti, Martyna Marczak, Gianluigi Mazzi	EUROMIND-D: A DENSITY ESTIMATE OF MONTHLY GROSS DOMESTIC PRODUCT FOR THE EURO AREA	520
04-2015	Thomas Beissinger, Nathalie Chusseau, Joël Hellier	OFFSHORING AND LABOUR MARKET REFORMS: MODELLING THE GERMAN EXPERIENCE	520
05-2015	Matthias Mueller, Kristina Bogner, Tobias Buchmann, Muhammed Kudic	SIMULATING KNOWLEDGE DIFFUSION IN FOUR STRUCTURALLY DISTINCT NETWORKS – AN AGENT-BASED SIMULATION MODEL	520
06-2015	Martyna Marczak, Thomas Beissinger	BIDIRECTIONAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INVESTOR SENTIMENT AND EXCESS RETURNS: NEW EVIDENCE FROM THE WAVELET PERSPECTIVE	520
07-2015	Peng Nie, Galit Nimrod, Alfonso Sousa-Poza	INTERNET USE AND SUBJECTIVE WELL-BEING IN CHINA	530

No.	Author	Title	Inst
08-2015	Fabian Wahl	THE LONG SHADOW OF HISTORY ROMAN LEGACY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT – EVIDENCE FROM THE GERMAN LINES	520
09-2015	Peng Nie, Alfonso Sousa-Poza	COMMUTE TIME AND SUBJECTIVE WELL-BEING IN URBAN CHINA	530
10-2015	Kristina Bogner	THE EFFECT OF PROJECT FUNDING ON INNOVATIVE PERFORMANCE AN AGENT-BASED SIMULATION MODEL	520
11-2015	Bogang Jun, Tai-Yoo Kim	A NEO-SCHUMPETERIAN PERSPECTIVE ON THE ANALYTICAL MACROECONOMIC FRAMEWORK: THE EXPANDED REPRODUCTION SYSTEM	520
12-2015	Volker Grossmann Aderonke Osikominu Marius Osterfeld	ARE SOCIOCULTURAL FACTORS IMPORTANT FOR STUDYING A SCIENCE UNIVERSITY MAJOR?	520
13-2015	Martyna Marczak Tommaso Proietti Stefano Grassi	A DATA–CLEANING AUGMENTED KALMAN FILTER FOR ROBUST ESTIMATION OF STATE SPACE MODELS	520
14-2015	Carolina Castagnetti Luisa Rosti Marina Töpfer	THE REVERSAL OF THE GENDER PAY GAP AMONG PUBLIC-CONTEST SELECTED YOUNG EMPLOYEES	520
15-2015	Alexander Opitz	DEMOCRATIC PROSPECTS IN IMPERIAL RUSSIA: THE REVOLUTION OF 1905 AND THE POLITICAL STOCK MARKET	520
01-2016	Michael Ahlheim, Jan Neidhardt	NON-TRADING BEHAVIOUR IN CHOICE EXPERIMENTS	520
02-2016	Bogang Jun, Alexander Gerybadze, Tai-Yoo Kim	THE LEGACY OF FRIEDRICH LIST: THE EXPANSIVE REPRODUCTION SYSTEM AND THE KOREAN HISTORY OF INDUSTRIALIZATION	520
03-2016	Peng Nie, Alfonso Sousa-Poza	FOOD INSECURITY AMONG OLDER EUROPEANS: EVIDENCE FROM THE SURVEY OF HEALTH, AGEING, AND RETIREMENT IN EUROPE	530
04-2016	Peter Spahn	POPULATION GROWTH, SAVING, INTEREST RATES AND STAGNATION. DISCUSSING THE EGGERTSSON- MEHROTRA-MODEL	520
05-2016	Vincent Dekker, Kristina Strohmaier, Nicole Bosch	A DATA-DRIVEN PROCEDURE TO DETERMINE THE BUNCHING WINDOW – AN APPLICATION TO THE NETHERLANDS	520
06-2016	Philipp Baudy, Dario Cords	DEREGULATION OF TEMPORARY AGENCY EMPLOYMENT IN A UNIONIZED ECONOMY: DOES THIS REALLY LEAD TO A SUBSTITUTION OF REGULAR EMPLOYMENT?	520

No.	Author	Title	Inst
07-2016	Robin Jessen, Davud Rostam-Afschar, Sebastian Schmitz	HOW IMPORTANT IS PRECAUTIONARY LABOR SUPPLY?	520
08-2016	Peng Nie, Alfonso Sousa-Poza, Jianhong Xue	FUEL FOR LIFE: DOMESTIC COOKING FUELS AND WOMEN'S HEALTH IN RURAL CHINA	530
09-2016	Bogang Jun, Seung Kyu-Yi, Tobias Buchmann, Matthias Müller	THE CO-EVOLUTION OF INNOVATION NETWORKS: COLLABORATION BETWEEN WEST AND EAST GERMANY FROM 1972 TO 2014	520
10-2016	Vladan Ivanovic, Vadim Kufenko, Boris Begovic Nenad Stanisic, Vincent Geloso	CONTINUITY UNDER A DIFFERENT NAME. THE OUTCOME OF PRIVATISATION IN SERBIA	520
11-2016	David E. Bloom Michael Kuhn Klaus Prettnner	THE CONTRIBUTION OF FEMALE HEALTH TO ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	520
12-2016	Franz X. Hof Klaus Prettnner	THE QUEST FOR STATUS AND R&D-BASED GROWTH	520
13-2016	Jung-In Yeon Andreas Pyka Tai-Yoo Kim	STRUCTURAL SHIFT AND INCREASING VARIETY IN KOREA, 1960–2010: EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE OF THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT MODEL BY THE CREATION OF NEW SECTORS	520
14-2016	Benjamin Fuchs	THE EFFECT OF TEENAGE EMPLOYMENT ON CHARACTER SKILLS, EXPECTATIONS AND OCCUPATIONAL CHOICE STRATEGIES	520
15-2016	Seung-Kyu Yi Bogang Jun	HAS THE GERMAN REUNIFICATION STRENGTHENED GERMANY'S NATIONAL INNOVATION SYSTEM? TRIPLE HELIX DYNAMICS OF GERMANY'S INNOVATION SYSTEM	520
16-2016	Gregor Pfeifer Fabian Wahl Martyna Marczak	ILLUMINATING THE WORLD CUP EFFECT: NIGHT LIGHTS EVIDENCE FROM SOUTH AFRICA	520
17-2016	Malte Klein Andreas Sauer	CELEBRATING 30 YEARS OF INNOVATION SYSTEM RESEARCH: WHAT YOU NEED TO KNOW ABOUT INNOVATION SYSTEMS	570
18-2016	Klaus Prettnner	THE IMPLICATIONS OF AUTOMATION FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH AND THE LABOR SHARE	520
19-2016	Klaus Prettnner Andreas Schaefer	HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE FALL AND RISE OF INEQUALITY	520
20-2016	Vadim Kufenko Klaus Prettnner	YOU CAN'T ALWAYS GET WHAT YOU WANT? ESTIMATOR CHOICE AND THE SPEED OF CONVERGENCE	520

No.	Author	Title	Inst
01-2017	Annarita Baldanzi Alberto Bucci Klaus Prettner	CHILDRENS HEALTH, HUMAN CAPITAL ACCUMULATION, AND R&D-BASED ECONOMIC GROWTH	INEPA
02-2017	Julius Tennert Marie Lambert Hans-Peter Burghof	MORAL HAZARD IN VC-FINANCE: MORE EXPENSIVE THAN YOU THOUGHT	INEF
03-2017	Michael Ahlheim Oliver Frör Nguyen Minh Duc Antonia Rehl Ute Siepmann Pham Van Dinh	LABOUR AS A UTILITY MEASURE RECONSIDERED	520
04-2017	Bohdan Kukharskyy Sebastian Seiffert	GUN VIOLENCE IN THE U.S.: CORRELATES AND CAUSES	520
05-2017	Ana Abeliasky Klaus Prettner	AUTOMATION AND DEMOGRAPHIC CHANGE	520
06-2017	Vincent Geloso Vadim Kufenko	INEQUALITY AND GUARD LABOR, OR PROHIBITION AND GUARD LABOR?	INEPA
07-2017	Emanuel Gasteiger Klaus Prettner	ON THE POSSIBILITY OF AUTOMATION-INDUCED STAGNATION	520
08-2017	Klaus Prettner Holger Strulik	THE LOST RACE AGAINST THE MACHINE: AUTOMATION, EDUCATION, AND INEQUALITY IN AN R&D-BASED GROWTH MODEL	INEPA
09-2017	David E. Bloom Simiao Chen Michael Kuhn Mark E. McGovern Les Oxley Klaus Prettner	THE ECONOMIC BURDEN OF CHRONIC DISEASES: ESTIMATES AND PROJECTIONS FOR CHINA, JAPAN, AND SOUTH KOREA	520
10-2017	Sebastian Till Braun Nadja Dwenger	THE LOCAL ENVIRONMENT SHAPES REFUGEE INTEGRATION: EVIDENCE FROM POST-WAR GERMANY	INEPA
11-2017	Vadim Kufenko Klaus Prettner Vincent Geloso	DIVERGENCE, CONVERGENCE, AND THE HISTORY-AUGMENTED SOLOW MODEL	INEPA
12-2017	Frank M. Fossen Ray Rees Davud Rostam-Afschar Viktor Steiner	HOW DO ENTREPRENEURIAL PORTFOLIOS RESPOND TO INCOME TAXATION?	520
13-2017	Steffen Otterbach Michael Rogan	SPATIAL DIFFERENCES IN STUNTING AND HOUSEHOLD AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION IN SOUTH AFRICA: (RE-) EXAMINING THE LINKS USING NATIONAL PANEL SURVEY DATA	INEPA
14-2017	Carolina Castagnetti Luisa Rosti Marina Töpfer	THE CONVERGENCE OF THE GENDER PAY GAP – AN ALTERNATIVE ESTIMATION APPROACH	INEPA



No.	Author	Title	Inst
15-2017	Andreas Hecht	ON THE DETERMINANTS OF SPECULATION – A CASE FOR EXTENDED DISCLOSURES IN CORPORATE RISK MANAGEMENT	510
16-2017	Mareike Schoop D. Marc Kilgour (Editors)	PROCEEDINGS OF THE 17 <sup>TH</sup> INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON GROUP DECISION AND NEGOTIATION	NegoTrans
17-2017	Mareike Schoop D. Marc Kilgour (Editors)	DOCTORAL CONSORTIUM OF THE 17 <sup>TH</sup> INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON GROUP DECISION AND NEGOTIATION	NegoTrans
18-2017	Sibylle Lehmann-Hasemeyer Fabian Wahl	SAVING BANKS AND THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION IN PRUSSIA SUPPORTING REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT WITH PUBLIC FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS	520
19-2017	Stephanie Glaser	A REVIEW OF SPATIAL ECONOMETRIC MODELS FOR COUNT DATA	520
20-2017	Dario Cords	ENDOGENOUS TECHNOLOGY, MATCHING, AND LABOUR UNIONS: DOES LOW-SKILLED IMMIGRATION AFFECT THE TECHNOLOGICAL ALIGNMENT OF THE HOST COUNTRY?	INEPA
21-2017	Micha Kaiser Jan M. Bauer	PRESCHOOL CHILD CARE AND CHILD WELL-BEING IN GERMANY: DOES THE MIGRANT EXPERIENCE DIFFER?	INEPA
22-2017	Thilo R. Huning Fabian Wahl	LORD OF THE LEMONS: ORIGIN AND DYNAMICS OF STATE CAPACITY	520
23-2017	Matthias Busse Ceren Erdogan Henning Mühlen	STRUCTURAL TRANSFORMATION AND ITS RELEVANCE FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH IN SUB-SHARAN AFRICA	INEPA
24-2017	Sibylle Lehmann-Hasemeyer Alexander Opitz	THE VALUE OF POLITICAL CONNECTIONS IN THE FIRST GERMAN DEMOCRACY – EVIDENCE FROM THE BERLIN STOCK EXCHANGE	520
25-2017	Samuel Mburu Micha Kaiser Alfonso Sousa-Poza	LIVESTOCK ASSET DYNAMICS AMONG PASTORALISTS IN NORTHERN KENYA	INEPA
26-2017	Marina Töpfer	DETAILED RIF DECOMPOSITION WITH SELECTION – THE GENDER PAY GAP IN ITALY	INEPA
27-2017	Robin Jessen Maria Metzinger Davud Rostam-Afschar	OPTIMAL TAXATION UNDER DIFFERENT CONCEPTS OF JUSTNESS	INEPA
28-2017	Alexander Kressner Katja Schimmelpfeng	CLUSTERING SURGICAL PROCEDURES FOR MASTER SURGICAL SCHEDULING	580
29-2017	Clemens Lankisch Klaus Prettnner Alexia Prskawetz	ROBOTS AND THE SKILL PREMIUM: AN AUTOMATION-BASED EXPLANATION OF WAGE INEQUALITY	INEPA

No.	Author	Title	Inst
30-2017	Ann-Sophie Adelhelm Melanie Bathelt Mirjam Bathelt Bettina Bürkin Sascha Klein Sabrina Straub Lea Wagner Fabienne Walz	ARBEITSWELT: DIGITAL – BELASTUNG: REAL? DER ERLEBTE WANDEL DER ARBEITSWELT INNERHALB DER IT-BRANCHE AUS SICHT DER ARBEITNEHMER	550
31-2017	Annarita Baldanzi Klaus Prettnner Paul Tscheuschner	LONGEVITY-INDUCED VERICAL INNOVATION AND THE TRADEOFF BETWEEN LIFE AND GROWTH	520
32-2017	Vincent Dekker Kristina Strohmaier	THE EFFECT OF TRANSFER PRICING REGULATIONS ON INTRA-INDUSTRY TRADE	520
01-2018	Michael D. Howard Johannes Kolb	FOUNDER CEOS AND NEW VENTURE MEDIA COVERAGE	INEF
02-2018	Peter Spahn	UNCONVENTIONAL VIEWS ON INFLATION CONTRAOL: FORWARD GUIDANCE, THE NEO- FISHERIAN APPROACH, AND THE FISCAL THEORY OF THE PRICE LEVEL	520
03-2018	Aderonke Osikominu Gregor Pfeifer	PERCEIVED WAGES AND THE GENDER GAP IN STEM FIELDS	INEPA

## FZID Discussion Papers

(published 2009-2014)

### Competence Centers

IK	Innovation and Knowledge
ICT	Information Systems and Communication Systems
CRFM	Corporate Finance and Risk Management
HCM	Health Care Management
CM	Communication Management
MM	Marketing Management
ECO	Economics

Download FZID Discussion Papers from our homepage: [https://wiso.uni-hohenheim.de/archiv\\_fzid\\_papers](https://wiso.uni-hohenheim.de/archiv_fzid_papers)

Nr.	Autor	Titel	CC
01-2009	Julian P. Christ	NEW ECONOMIC GEOGRAPHY RELOADED: Localized Knowledge Spillovers and the Geography of Innovation	IK
02-2009	André P. Slowak	MARKET FIELD STRUCTURE & DYNAMICS IN INDUSTRIAL AUTOMATION	IK
03-2009	Pier Paolo Saviotti, Andreas Pyka	GENERALIZED BARRIERS TO ENTRY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	IK
04-2009	Uwe Focht, Andreas Richter and Jörg Schiller	INTERMEDIATION AND MATCHING IN INSURANCE MARKETS	HCM
05-2009	Julian P. Christ, André P. Slowak	WHY BLU-RAY VS. HD-DVD IS NOT VHS VS. BETAMAX: THE CO-EVOLUTION OF STANDARD-SETTING CONSORTIA	IK
06-2009	Gabriel Felbermayr, Mario Larch and Wolfgang Lechthaler	UNEMPLOYMENT IN AN INTERDEPENDENT WORLD	ECO
07-2009	Steffen Otterbach	MISMATCHES BETWEEN ACTUAL AND PREFERRED WORK TIME: Empirical Evidence of Hours Constraints in 21 Countries	HCM
08-2009	Sven Wydra	PRODUCTION AND EMPLOYMENT IMPACTS OF NEW TECHNOLOGIES – ANALYSIS FOR BIOTECHNOLOGY	IK
09-2009	Ralf Richter, Jochen Streb	CATCHING-UP AND FALLING BEHIND KNOWLEDGE SPILLOVER FROM AMERICAN TO GERMAN MACHINE TOOL MAKERS	IK

<b>Nr.</b>	<b>Autor</b>	<b>Titel</b>	<b>CC</b>
10-2010	Rahel Aichele, Gabriel Felbermayr	KYOTO AND THE CARBON CONTENT OF TRADE	ECO
11-2010	David E. Bloom, Alfonso Sousa-Poza	ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES OF LOW FERTILITY IN EUROPE	HCM
12-2010	Michael Ahlheim, Oliver Frör	DRINKING AND PROTECTING – A MARKET APPROACH TO THE PRESERVATION OF CORK OAK LANDSCAPES	ECO
13-2010	Michael Ahlheim, Oliver Frör, Antonia Heinke, Nguyen Minh Duc, and Pham Van Dinh	LABOUR AS A UTILITY MEASURE IN CONTINGENT VALUATION STUDIES – HOW GOOD IS IT REALLY?	ECO
14-2010	Julian P. Christ	THE GEOGRAPHY AND CO-LOCATION OF EUROPEAN TECHNOLOGY-SPECIFIC CO-INVENTORSHIP NETWORKS	IK
15-2010	Harald Degner	WINDOWS OF TECHNOLOGICAL OPPORTUNITY DO TECHNOLOGICAL BOOMS INFLUENCE THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FIRM SIZE AND INNOVATIVENESS?	IK
16-2010	Tobias A. Jopp	THE WELFARE STATE EVOLVES: GERMAN KNAPPSCHAFTEN, 1854-1923	HCM
17-2010	Stefan Kirn (Ed.)	PROCESS OF CHANGE IN ORGANISATIONS THROUGH eHEALTH	ICT
18-2010	Jörg Schiller	ÖKONOMISCHE ASPEKTE DER ENTLOHNUNG UND REGULIERUNG UNABHÄNGIGER VERSICHERUNGSVERMITTLER	HCM
19-2010	Frauke Lammers, Jörg Schiller	CONTRACT DESIGN AND INSURANCE FRAUD: AN EXPERIMENTAL INVESTIGATION	HCM
20-2010	Martyna Marczak, Thomas Beissinger	REAL WAGES AND THE BUSINESS CYCLE IN GERMANY	ECO
21-2010	Harald Degner, Jochen Streb	FOREIGN PATENTING IN GERMANY, 1877-1932	IK
22-2010	Heiko Stüber, Thomas Beissinger	DOES DOWNWARD NOMINAL WAGE RIGIDITY DAMPEN WAGE INCREASES?	ECO
23-2010	Mark Spoerer, Jochen Streb	GUNS AND BUTTER – BUT NO MARGARINE: THE IMPACT OF NAZI ECONOMIC POLICIES ON GERMAN FOOD CONSUMPTION, 1933-38	ECO

Nr.	Autor	Titel	CC
24-2011	Dhammika Dharmapala, Nadine Riedel	EARNINGS SHOCKS AND TAX-MOTIVATED INCOME-SHIFTING: EVIDENCE FROM EUROPEAN MULTINATIONALS	ECO
25-2011	Michael Schuele, Stefan Kirn	QUALITATIVES, RÄUMLICHES SCHLIEßEN ZUR KOLLISIONSERKENNUNG UND KOLLISIONSVERMEIDUNG AUTONOMER BDI-AGENTEN	ICT
26-2011	Marcus Müller, Guillaume Stern, Ansger Jacob and Stefan Kirn	VERHALTENSMODELLE FÜR SOFTWAREAGENTEN IM PUBLIC GOODS GAME	ICT
27-2011	Monnet Benoit, Patrick Gbakoua and Alfonso Sousa-Poza	ENGEL CURVES, SPATIAL VARIATION IN PRICES AND DEMAND FOR COMMODITIES IN CÔTE D'IVOIRE	ECO
28-2011	Nadine Riedel, Hannah Schildberg- Hörisch	ASYMMETRIC OBLIGATIONS	ECO
29-2011	Nicole Waidlein	CAUSES OF PERSISTENT PRODUCTIVITY DIFFERENCES IN THE WEST GERMAN STATES IN THE PERIOD FROM 1950 TO 1990	IK
30-2011	Dominik Hartmann, Atilio Arata	MEASURING SOCIAL CAPITAL AND INNOVATION IN POOR AGRICULTURAL COMMUNITIES. THE CASE OF CHÁPARRA - PERU	IK
31-2011	Peter Spahn	DIE WÄHRUNGSKRISEUNION DIE EURO-VERSCHULDUNG DER NATIONALSTAATEN ALS SCHWACHSTELLE DER EWU	ECO
32-2011	Fabian Wahl	DIE ENTWICKLUNG DES LEBENSSTANDARDS IM DRITTEN REICH – EINE GLÜCKSÖKONOMISCHE PERSPEKTIVE	ECO
33-2011	Giorgio Triulzi, Ramon Scholz and Andreas Pyka	R&D AND KNOWLEDGE DYNAMICS IN UNIVERSITY-INDUSTRY RELATIONSHIPS IN BIOTECH AND PHARMACEUTICALS: AN AGENT-BASED MODEL	IK
34-2011	Claus D. Müller- Hengstenberg, Stefan Kirn	ANWENDUNG DES ÖFFENTLICHEN VERGABERECHTS AUF MODERNE IT SOFTWAREENTWICKLUNGSVERFAHREN	ICT
35-2011	Andreas Pyka	AVOIDING EVOLUTIONARY INEFFICIENCIES IN INNOVATION NETWORKS	IK
36-2011	David Bell, Steffen Otterbach and Alfonso Sousa-Poza	WORK HOURS CONSTRAINTS AND HEALTH	HCM
37-2011	Lukas Scheffknecht, Felix Geiger	A BEHAVIORAL MACROECONOMIC MODEL WITH ENDOGENOUS BOOM-BUST CYCLES AND LEVERAGE DYNAMICS	ECO
38-2011	Yin Krogmann, Ulrich Schwalbe	INTER-FIRM R&D NETWORKS IN THE GLOBAL PHARMACEUTICAL BIOTECHNOLOGY INDUSTRY DURING 1985–1998: A CONCEPTUAL AND EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS	IK

<b>Nr.</b>	<b>Autor</b>	<b>Titel</b>	<b>CC</b>
39-2011	Michael Ahlheim, Tobias Börger and Oliver Frör	RESPONDENT INCENTIVES IN CONTINGENT VALUATION: THE ROLE OF RECIPROCITY	ECO
40-2011	Tobias Börger	A DIRECT TEST OF SOCIALLY DESIRABLE RESPONDING IN CONTINGENT VALUATION INTERVIEWS	ECO
41-2011	Ralf Rukwid, Julian P. Christ	QUANTITATIVE CLUSTERIDENTIFIKATION AUF EBENE DER DEUTSCHEN STADT- UND LANDKREISE (1999-2008)	IK

Nr.	Autor	Titel	CC
42-2012	Benjamin Schön, Andreas Pyka	A TAXONOMY OF INNOVATION NETWORKS	IK
43-2012	Dirk Foremny, Nadine Riedel	BUSINESS TAXES AND THE ELECTORAL CYCLE	ECO
44-2012	Gisela Di Meglio, Andreas Pyka and Luis Rubalcaba	VARIETIES OF SERVICE ECONOMIES IN EUROPE	IK
45-2012	Ralf Rukwid, Julian P. Christ	INNOVATIONSPOTENTIALE IN BADEN-WÜRTTEMBERG: PRODUKTIONSCLUSTER IM BEREICH „METALL, ELEKTRO, IKT“ UND REGIONALE VERFÜGBARKEIT AKADEMISCHER FACHKRÄFTE IN DEN MINT-FÄCHERN	IK
46-2012	Julian P. Christ, Ralf Rukwid	INNOVATIONSPOTENTIALE IN BADEN-WÜRTTEMBERG: BRANCHENSPEZIFISCHE FORSCHUNGS- UND ENTWICKLUNGSAKTIVITÄT, REGIONALES PATENTAUFKOMMEN UND BESCHÄFTIGUNGSSTRUKTUR	IK
47-2012	Oliver Sauter	ASSESSING UNCERTAINTY IN EUROPE AND THE US - IS THERE A COMMON FACTOR?	ECO
48-2012	Dominik Hartmann	SEN MEETS SCHUMPETER. INTRODUCING STRUCTURAL AND DYNAMIC ELEMENTS INTO THE HUMAN CAPABILITY APPROACH	IK
49-2012	Harold Paredes- Frigolett, Andreas Pyka	DISTAL EMBEDDING AS A TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION NETWORK FORMATION STRATEGY	IK
50-2012	Martyna Marczak, Víctor Gómez	CYCLICALITY OF REAL WAGES IN THE USA AND GERMANY: NEW INSIGHTS FROM WAVELET ANALYSIS	ECO
51-2012	André P. Slowak	DIE DURCHSETZUNG VON SCHNITTSTELLEN IN DER STANDARDSETZUNG: FALLBEISPIEL LADESYSTEM ELEKTROMOBILITÄT	IK
52-2012	Fabian Wahl	WHY IT MATTERS WHAT PEOPLE THINK - BELIEFS, LEGAL ORIGINS AND THE DEEP ROOTS OF TRUST	ECO
53-2012	Dominik Hartmann, Micha Kaiser	STATISTISCHER ÜBERBLICK DER TÜRKISCHEN MIGRATION IN BADEN-WÜRTTEMBERG UND DEUTSCHLAND	IK
54-2012	Dominik Hartmann, Andreas Pyka, Seda Aydin, Lena Klauß, Fabian Stahl, Ali Santircioglu, Silvia Oberegelsbacher, Sheida Rashidi, Gaye Onan and Suna Erginkoç	IDENTIFIZIERUNG UND ANALYSE DEUTSCH-TÜRKISCHER INNOVATIONSNETZWERKE. ERSTE ERGEBNISSE DES TGIN- PROJEKTES	IK
55-2012	Michael Ahlheim, Tobias Börger and Oliver Frör	THE ECOLOGICAL PRICE OF GETTING RICH IN A GREEN DESERT: A CONTINGENT VALUATION STUDY IN RURAL SOUTHWEST CHINA	ECO

<b>Nr.</b>	<b>Autor</b>	<b>Titel</b>	<b>CC</b>
56-2012	Matthias Striffler Thomas Beissinger	FAIRNESS CONSIDERATIONS IN LABOR UNION WAGE SETTING – A THEORETICAL ANALYSIS	ECO
57-2012	Peter Spahn	INTEGRATION DURCH WÄHRUNGSUNION? DER FALL DER EURO-ZONE	ECO
58-2012	Sibylle H. Lehmann	TAKING FIRMS TO THE STOCK MARKET: IPOS AND THE IMPORTANCE OF LARGE BANKS IN IMPERIAL GERMANY 1896-1913	ECO
59-2012	Sibylle H. Lehmann, Philipp Hauber and Alexander Opitz	POLITICAL RIGHTS, TAXATION, AND FIRM VALUATION – EVIDENCE FROM SAXONY AROUND 1900	ECO
60-2012	Martyna Marczak, V́ctor Ǵmez	SPECTRAN, A SET OF MATLAB PROGRAMS FOR SPECTRAL ANALYSIS	ECO
61-2012	Theresa Lohse, Nadine Riedel	THE IMPACT OF TRANSFER PRICING REGULATIONS ON PROFIT SHIFTING WITHIN EUROPEAN MULTINATIONALS	ECO



<b>Nr.</b>	<b>Autor</b>	<b>Titel</b>	<b>CC</b>
62-2013	Heiko Stüber	REAL WAGE CYCLICALITY OF NEWLY HIRED WORKERS	ECO
63-2013	David E. Bloom, Alfonso Sousa-Poza	AGEING AND PRODUCTIVITY	HCM
64-2013	Martyna Marczak, V́ctor Ǵmez	MONTHLY US BUSINESS CYCLE INDICATORS: A NEW MULTIVARIATE APPROACH BASED ON A BAND-PASS FILTER	ECO
65-2013	Dominik Hartmann, Andreas Pyka	INNOVATION, ECONOMIC DIVERSIFICATION AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT	IK
66-2013	Christof Ernst, Katharina Richter and Nadine Riedel	CORPORATE TAXATION AND THE QUALITY OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	ECO
67-2013	Michael Ahlheim, Oliver Frör, Jiang Tong, Luo Jing and Sonna Pelz	NONUSE VALUES OF CLIMATE POLICY - AN EMPIRICAL STUDY IN XINJIANG AND BEIJING	ECO
68-2013	Michael Ahlheim, Friedrich Schneider	CONSIDERING HOUSEHOLD SIZE IN CONTINGENT VALUATION STUDIES	ECO
69-2013	Fabio Bertoni, Tereza Tykvová	WHICH FORM OF VENTURE CAPITAL IS MOST SUPPORTIVE OF INNOVATION? EVIDENCE FROM EUROPEAN BIOTECHNOLOGY COMPANIES	CFRM
70-2013	Tobias Buchmann, Andreas Pyka	THE EVOLUTION OF INNOVATION NETWORKS: THE CASE OF A GERMAN AUTOMOTIVE NETWORK	IK
71-2013	B. Vermeulen, A. Pyka, J. A. La Poutré and A. G. de Kok	CAPABILITY-BASED GOVERNANCE PATTERNS OVER THE PRODUCT LIFE-CYCLE	IK
72-2013	Beatriz Fabiola López Ulloa, Valerie Møller and Alfonso Sousa- Poza	HOW DOES SUBJECTIVE WELL-BEING EVOLVE WITH AGE? A LITERATURE REVIEW	HCM
73-2013	Wencke Gwozdz, Alfonso Sousa-Poza, Lucia A. Reisch, Wolfgang Ahrens, Stefaan De Henauw, Gabriele Eiben, Juan M. Fernández-Alvira, Charalampos Hadjigeorgiou, Eva Kovács, Fabio Lauria, Toomas Veidebaum, Garrath Williams, Karin Bammann	MATERNAL EMPLOYMENT AND CHILDHOOD OBESITY – A EUROPEAN PERSPECTIVE	HCM

<b>Nr.</b>	<b>Autor</b>	<b>Titel</b>	<b>CC</b>
74-2013	Andreas Haas, Annette Hofmann	RISIKEN AUS CLOUD-COMPUTING-SERVICES: FRAGEN DES RISIKOMANAGEMENTS UND ASPEKTE DER VERSICHERBARKEIT	HCM
75-2013	Yin Krogmann, Nadine Riedel and Ulrich Schwalbe	INTER-FIRM R&D NETWORKS IN PHARMACEUTICAL BIOTECHNOLOGY: WHAT DETERMINES FIRM'S CENTRALITY-BASED PARTNERING CAPABILITY?	ECO, IK
76-2013	Peter Spahn	MACROECONOMIC STABILISATION AND BANK LENDING: A SIMPLE WORKHORSE MODEL	ECO
77-2013	Sheida Rashidi, Andreas Pyka	MIGRATION AND INNOVATION – A SURVEY	IK
78-2013	Benjamin Schön, Andreas Pyka	THE SUCCESS FACTORS OF TECHNOLOGY-SOURCING THROUGH MERGERS & ACQUISITIONS – AN INTUITIVE META- ANALYSIS	IK
79-2013	Irene Probstlupow, Andreas Pyka and Barbara Heller-Schuh	TURKISH-GERMAN INNOVATION NETWORKS IN THE EUROPEAN RESEARCH LANDSCAPE	IK
80-2013	Eva Schlenker, Kai D. Schmid	CAPITAL INCOME SHARES AND INCOME INEQUALITY IN THE EUROPEAN UNION	ECO
81-2013	Michael Ahlheim, Tobias Börger and Oliver Frör	THE INFLUENCE OF ETHNICITY AND CULTURE ON THE VALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENTS – RESULTS FROM A CVM STUDY IN SOUTHWEST CHINA –	ECO
82-2013	Fabian Wahl	DOES MEDIEVAL TRADE STILL MATTER? HISTORICAL TRADE CENTERS, AGGLOMERATION AND CONTEMPORARY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	ECO
83-2013	Peter Spahn	SUBPRIME AND EURO CRISIS: SHOULD WE BLAME THE ECONOMISTS?	ECO
84-2013	Daniel Guffarth, Michael J. Barber	THE EUROPEAN AEROSPACE R&D COLLABORATION NETWORK	IK
85-2013	Athanasios Saitis	KARTELLBEKÄMPFUNG UND INTERNE KARTELLSTRUKTUREN: EIN NETZWERKTHEORETISCHER ANSATZ	IK

<b>Nr.</b>	<b>Autor</b>	<b>Titel</b>	<b>CC</b>
86-2014	Stefan Kirn, Claus D. Müller-Hengstenberg	INTELLIGENTE (SOFTWARE-)AGENTEN: EINE NEUE HERAUSFORDERUNG FÜR DIE GESELLSCHAFT UND UNSER RECHTSSYSTEM?	ICT
87-2014	Peng Nie, Alfonso Sousa-Poza	MATERNAL EMPLOYMENT AND CHILDHOOD OBESITY IN CHINA: EVIDENCE FROM THE CHINA HEALTH AND NUTRITION SURVEY	HCM
88-2014	Steffen Otterbach, Alfonso Sousa-Poza	JOB INSECURITY, EMPLOYABILITY, AND HEALTH: AN ANALYSIS FOR GERMANY ACROSS GENERATIONS	HCM
89-2014	Carsten Burhop, Sibylle H. Lehmann-Hasemeyer	THE GEOGRAPHY OF STOCK EXCHANGES IN IMPERIAL GERMANY	ECO
90-2014	Martyna Marczak, Tommaso Proietti	OUTLIER DETECTION IN STRUCTURAL TIME SERIES MODELS: THE INDICATOR SATURATION APPROACH	ECO
91-2014	Sophie Urmetzer, Andreas Pyka	VARIETIES OF KNOWLEDGE-BASED BIOECONOMIES	IK
92-2014	Bogang Jun, Joongho Lee	THE TRADEOFF BETWEEN FERTILITY AND EDUCATION: EVIDENCE FROM THE KOREAN DEVELOPMENT PATH	IK
93-2014	Bogang Jun, Tai-Yoo Kim	NON-FINANCIAL HURDLES FOR HUMAN CAPITAL ACCUMULATION: LANDOWNERSHIP IN KOREA UNDER JAPANESE RULE	IK
94-2014	Michael Ahlheim, Oliver Frör, Gerhard Langenberger and Sonna Pelz	CHINESE URBANITES AND THE PRESERVATION OF RARE SPECIES IN REMOTE PARTS OF THE COUNTRY – THE EXAMPLE OF EAGLEWOOD	ECO
95-2014	Harold Paredes-Frigolett, Andreas Pyka, Javier Pereira and Luiz Flávio Autran Monteiro Gomes	RANKING THE PERFORMANCE OF NATIONAL INNOVATION SYSTEMS IN THE IBERIAN PENINSULA AND LATIN AMERICA FROM A NEO-SCHUMPETERIAN ECONOMICS PERSPECTIVE	IK
96-2014	Daniel Guffarth, Michael J. Barber	NETWORK EVOLUTION, SUCCESS, AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE EUROPEAN AEROSPACE INDUSTRY	IK

## IMPRINT

University of Hohenheim  
Dean's Office of the Faculty of Business, Economics and Social Sciences  
Palace Hohenheim 1 B  
70593 Stuttgart | Germany  
Fon +49 (0)711 459 22488  
Fax +49 (0)711 459 22785  
[wiso@uni-hohenheim.de](mailto:wiso@uni-hohenheim.de)  
[wiso.uni-hohenheim.de](http://wiso.uni-hohenheim.de)